

Serial No. 10/715,396
January 12, 2006
Reply to the Office Action dated October 20, 2005
Page 4 of 6

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 1 and cancels claims 12-17.

Claims 12-17 have been canceled since these claims are directed to a non-elected invention. Applicant reserves the right to file a Divisional Application in order to pursue prosecution of non-elected claims 12-17.

Claims 1-6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Katsuta (JP 2000-261284). Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuta in view of Suga et al. (US 2002/0140322). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-11.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

“An electronic component comprising:
a substrate:
at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion and a connecting portion provided on the substrate; and
a structural piece made of a resin material having a flat plate shape and directly covering at least the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion such that no structural elements are disposed between the structural piece and the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion; wherein
the structural piece has an integrated structure and is provided with a concavity including a top portion and side walls covering the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion, the concavity defining a space so as not to disturb at least the vibration of the piezoelectric vibrating portion.”
(emphasis added)

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's claim 1, including the feature of “a structural piece made of a resin material having a flat plate shape and directly covering at least the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion such that no structural elements are disposed between the structural piece and the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion,” Applicant has been able to provide an electronic component having a reduced height and size. In addition, the structural piece can be mounted on the substrate so as to cross the wiring disposed on the substrate,

Serial No. 10/715,396
January 12, 2006
Reply to the Office Action dated October 20, 2005
Page 5 of 6

thus, enabling the chip size to be greatly reduced (see, for example, the third full paragraph on page 4 of the originally filed specification).

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Katsuta teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's claim 1, including "a structural piece (6) made of a resin material (note that resin falls under the aegis of an insulator) having a flat plate shaped [sic] and covering at least the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion [(2)]."

Applicant's claim 1 has been amended to recite the feature of "a structural piece made of a resin material having a flat plate shape and directly covering at least the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion such that no structural elements are disposed between the structural piece and the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion." Support for this feature is found, for example, in Fig. 2 of the originally filed application.

In contrast to Applicant's claim 1, element 6 of Katsuta, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the structural piece recited in Applicant's claim 1, is disposed so as to cover the protection cover 4 and the piezoelectric vibrating portion 2 disposed under the protection cover 4. In other words, at best, element 6 of Katsuta indirectly covers the piezoelectric vibrating portion 2 such that structural element 4 (protection cover) is disposed between element 6 and the piezoelectric vibrating portion 2.

Thus, Katsuta clearly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "a structural piece made of a resin material having a flat plate shape and directly covering at least the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion such that no structural elements are disposed between the structural piece and the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion" as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Katsuta.

The Examiner relied upon Suga et al. to allegedly cure deficiencies of Katsuta. However, Suga et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "a structural piece made of a resin material having a flat plate shape and directly covering at least the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion such that no structural elements are disposed

Serial No. 10/715,396
January 12, 2006
Reply to the Office Action dated October 20, 2005
Page 6 of 6

between the structural piece and the at least one piezoelectric vibrating portion" as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Suga et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Katsuta described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Katsuta and Suga et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicant's claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-11 depend upon claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 12, 2006


Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499